October 17, 2000

Ms. Erin Perales General Counsel Houston Municipal Employees Pension System 1111 Bagby, Suite 1450 Houston, Texas 77002-2503

OR2000-4032

Dear Ms. Perales:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 140415.

The Houston Municipal Employees Pension System (the "system") received a request for information pertaining to a specified individual. You state that you have released documents in the file of the specified individual. You claim that the portions of the submitted letter not related to the specified individual are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You argue that sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code excepts insurance coverage, insurance elections, and premiums amounts of former city employees and surviving dependents. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code. *Inclustrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code protects "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," including information protected by the common law right of privacy. *Id.* The doctrine of common law privacy protects information that contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts about a person's private affairs such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and the information must be of no legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* 

In Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983), this office concluded that

all financial information relating to an individual — including sources of income, salary, mortgage payments, assets, medical and utility bills, social security and veterans benefits, retirement and state assistance benefits, and credit history — ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of common law privacy, in that it constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing facts about the individual, such that its public disclosure would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities.

ORD No. 373 at 3 (1983). Prior decisions of this office have found that financial information relating to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common law privacy, but that there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990), 373 (1983). A public employee's allocation of his salary to a voluntary investment program offered by his employer is a personal investment decision, and information about it is excepted from disclosure by a common law right of privacy. Open Records Decision No. 545 (deferred compensation plan). Information revealing that an employee participates in a group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by the governmental body is not excepted from disclosure by a common law right of privacy. Open Records Decision No. 600 at 10 (1992). For example, this office has held that an employee's participation in the Texas Municipal Retirement System or in a group insurance plan funded by the governmental body is not excepted from disclosure under common law privacy. Id., Open Records Decision No. 480 (1987). Therefore, to the extent that the insurance coverage, elections, and premiums are voluntary and not funded partly or wholly by a governmental body, the system must withhold this information under sections 552.101 and 552.102.

You also assert that the social security numbers of former public employees and names of surviving dependents are excepted under section 552.117(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(1) excepts from disclosure information that relates to the home addresses, home telephone numbers, social security numbers and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information remain confidential under section 552.024. Therefore, you must withhold the social security numbers and family member information of the employees that elected that this information remain confidential under section 552.024.

We also note that social security numbers may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). See Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that were obtained or are maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any

provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. See id. Thus, section 552.101 and federal law do not make all social security numbers excepted from disclosure but only the social security numbers that were obtained or maintained by the system pursuant to a provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

In conclusion, you must withhold voluntary insurance coverage under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. Further, you must withhold social security numbers and family member information of former employees under section 552.117(1) if an election was made under section 552.024. You must also withhold any social security numbers that were obtained or maintained by the system pursuant to a provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. Id. § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Bialek

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

ermba Brales

ЛНВ\er

Ref:

ID# 140415

Encl:

Submitted documents

CC:

Ms. Sylvia Botello

5600 North Freeway, #101 Houston, Texas 77076-4723

(w/o enclosures)